

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROMEO ARANAS, et al.,

Defendants.

3:19-cv-0068-MMD-CLB

ORDER

Plaintiff filed a motion for clarification (ECF No. 76) of the court's scheduling order (ECF No. 46). Plaintiff's motion is improper in that he is seeking a ruling from this court allowing him to forego Local Rule 26-6(b) which requires him "to set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and response to it." Plaintiff seeks a ruling that he may only attach a copy of the discovery and responses to any motion. This is contrary to the Local Rules and is **DENIED**.

The court notes that no fewer than six motions are currently pending (ECF Nos. 55, 65, 67, 70, 72, & 79). Plaintiff is advised that filing new motions that are, in substance, identical to motions he has already filed, and/or filing motions seeking "updates" or immediate action on pending motions will not increase the speed with which the court is able to proceed in this case. The court has a heavy docket. Plaintiff's case is just one of hundreds before the court. The court rules on motions in the order that they are received. Thus, plaintiff's repetitive filings only *slow* the pace of this litigation by requiring the court's attention and consideration of small and secondary matters instead of the central issues in this case. Therefore, the court orders that no further motions shall be filed in this case until all pending motions are fully briefed and ruled upon by this court.

DATED: March 5, 2021.


 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE